The Reverend N. Courtland Robinson D.D.
3504 Baring Street,
Philadelphia.

My dear Dr. Robinson,

Do pastors ever notice the coming, and going, of last pew folks? I have felt, since I left West-Philadelphia lodgings, as if I should like to give an account of the "plain Jane" who occupied a back corner in your church, whenever possible, during some months past, and

also, to express her appreciation of the blessings received there. You cannot know what the Northminster Church was to me, but I shall never forget it, nor the rest that came to my bruised, battered self the very first time I entered its doors. Was it not Will Carleton who wrote, "If you want a man to appreciate heaven well, just keep him ten minutes in _____ State College was the place I had been "kept" where the word of God had been laid aside for the "say so"

of a little college president and his penny professors. I still feel dazed when I think of it - and why I ever went to such a place as State College is more than I can fathom. I only know that I was hardly among those Pagan hills before, like "Pat," I was "in for gettin' out." The few months spent in that place left me broken in heart, and spirit, but, the moment I entered "Northminster," my very soul seemed to

cry out "Lord, this is indeed thy house - the place where thine honour dwelleth." My church letter would have been brought there immediately, but, as I tell my old friends, I am only a lodger, now, little better than the corner loafer to whom the policeman, in the shape of fate, is continually saying "Why do you loiter here? Move on please - move right along," and we "do move." If I joined each church as I passed along, I should be much like a come-and-go member

of my home church, in Norristown, the old "Brown", of which Dr. Thomas Beeber is pastor – this member "unjoined" and rejoined, himself so often, I said, "Samuel plays a regular clap in, clap out, game with his church letter. He keeps one busy trying to remember which it will be next-time, out or in." I was carried up the aisle of the "First" church, as an infant, and "grew up" within its gates, so that if my name remains upon the church records, that

is one spot, at least, where I abide. I have found Dr. Colfelt on this side of the river - he, too, gives his flock the "Word" - but I shall never cease feeling thankful to you for the soul satisfaction which I received while a transient member of your congregation. With heartfelt gratitude, and the prayer that God's richest blessings may rest upon the Northminster

church, its pastor, and people, I am

Sincerely yours,

Jennie Naomi Landes.

2205 Spring Garden Street,

Philadelphia,

October 20th., 1911.

Dear Dr Robinson.

How splendidly the people of Northminster Church showed their affection for you yesterday, and it was largely a tribute to you, because had they not felt this regard for you, your efforts would have fallen flat. All those who spoke with no

last evening seemed
delighted
With sincere congratulations
Your friend
Mabel E. Finch
Monday. Dec. 16th 1912.

409 WALNUT STREET
READING, PENN.

My dear Mr. Robinson,

You were such a surpassingly good friend to Robin at great stress of need, that if there is need now, I ask it again. This seems a strange thing for me to have to write - but I have been greatly troubled lest some hasty and unthinking words of mine should

have travelled and created a wrong impression, I so feared it! Ill report travels with such winged feet while the good crawls with leaden feet. In a moment of great discouragement, I said, "Mr. Blackburn can do nothing with this Church", in no way meaning that he was not equal to his task, but that this was such a hard parish, in this German community, where the Church grows only from people who move here, and such families stay but a short time, that Bob was not equal to his task would be a mill stone around his neck that would down him, professionally, he is too splendid a man to have that impression get abroad. I am sure the congregation are devoted to him, we have not always felt the response that would have encouraged us more but that is due to the nature of the commu-

nilg not to any lack on their part, it is only just that I should bear testimony to their kindness.

It is not modest in me to say I think Bob is considered a very excellent preacher but you will understand why I say it, but I have given a different impression — he certainly has one of the loveliest natures, God ever gave a man. There is no trouble here, we are working away to the best

of our ability, and
whatever mistakes
have been made,
are not cherished.

Please do not trouble
to answer this, I am sorry
to have to write it but
it will ease my mind
so greatly to feel that
a timely word from
you might save Bob
from misjudgment
after his years of

hard work and able work too. Thank you so much and kind remembrances to your good wife, whom I imagine never says anything she should not!

Cordially,

Susan M. Williams Blackburn

March the eighteenth.

NEW YORK CITY: 156 FIFTH AVENUE PHILADELPHIA: WITHERSPOON BUILDING CHICAGO: 509 SOUTH WABASH AVENUE

NOLAN R. BEST, Editor OLIVER R. WILLIAMSON, Publisher

The CONTINENT

CONTINUING THE INTERIOR AND THE WESTMINSTER

New York City,
June 15, 1915.

Dr. W. C. Robinson,
3504 Baring Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

My dear Dr. Robinson:-

I am more than grateful to you for your good letter of June 4. I do appreciate your frank and straightforward "come back" on this question. It was in my heart while at Rochester to hunt you out and say to you that I was greatly disappointed in your section of the Union Seminary report and tell you why. But I did not do so because I was too busy to make a deliberate effort to seek you out in your room, and I didn't chance to see you on the street or in the hotel lobby at any time when you were not occupied with other friends. Then, I confess to you, I feared that if I did speak I might succeed only in appearing to you intrusive and meddlesome. But if I had had before experience of your frankness in such a letter as you have now sent me, I am sure I would not have hesitated on this latter account.

As for the paper, I at first had thought of taking a little editorial space to show the criticisms on your part of the report to which I thought it was open. But on further reflection I thought it better to let the whole matter be buried, and so passed it over with only the allusion to which your attention has been drawn. Further than that I do not think of alluding to the matter in The Continent; but privately in answer to your courteous inquiry it is only fair for me to indicate briefly the reasons why I felt that your section of the report had more of the character of a lawyer's brief against the seminary than the character of an impartial statement of facts. I am happy to know by your own good assurance that you were not conscious of an attempt to make a case, but perhaps when I tell you how your report impressed me, you will see the points which are liable to such a construction.

Speaking thus frankly, forgive me saying that the portion of your report which offended me most was on pages 66 and 67, where you quote the statement of the directors of Union Theological Seminary as submitted to the previous committee March 27, 1913. Here I must frankly say that it seems to me some of your use of italics is painfully invidious. I cannot see that there is any point in using italics unless it is signified that the portions of the statement italicized are obnoxious points. Yet I find that you have italicized the sentence, "We do not think alike on all matters." Now it certainly cannot be that you intended to hold Union Seminary up to ridicule on this score, or even that you intended to distinguish Union Seminary from other seminaries of even our own church by marking out this characteristic as strange or peculiar. Is it imaginable that there is any seminary in our own church or in any other of which the same statement would not be true? Certainly it is not a shame but a glory to any Protestant school of learning that its faculty members "do not think alike on all matters." Italicizing these words implies, as it appears to me, that the Presbyterian Church means

to have a ministry thinking alike on all matters, which is equivalent to saying that it is striving to secure a ministry without liberty and without variations of complexion. I do not think any such implication fair to Presbyterianism, and I certainly would contend with all my might against an attempt to fasten that character upon our church. And I do think that a committee of present-day Presbyterians, instead of fastening on this kind of a statement to depreciate Union, ought to have fixed upon it as one thing to praise in the school, if the report was strictly impartial between praise and blame.

Then on page 68 I do not agree to the "facts" to which you there direct attention. Here it seems to me your interpretation has given a bias to the quotations that is not fair to Union or fair to the Presbyterian Church. You say respecting the directors' statement: "There is no mention of the Bible as a supreme final authority in theological controversy." As for theological controversy, I admit that there is no reference to it, in the Union Seminary statement ~~to it~~, and it seems to me that your committee ought to have written "Praise God!" for that, because theological controversy is precisely what our church has been twenty years atoning for in pain and sorrow and seeking to escape for the future. As for the rest of it, however, there is in the statement a mention of the Bible as "the supreme and final authority" of religion. It is just as strong a statement as the Westminster Confession contains, and the only difference is that it is couched in another vocabulary from that which the Confession uses. It is true, as you say, that there is no mention of the Virgin Birth of Jesus, but Dr. Minton of Trenton made a passionate speech on the essentials of religion in Assembly and he made no mention of the Virgin Birth. Moreover, contrary to your statement, there is mention made of the sacrifice of Jesus, ~~made~~, and of the bodily resurrection and an implication which fully covers his miracles. The truth of the matter is that this statement of Union is one of the most exalted and thrilling summaries in recent years of the evangelical and evangelistic religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for which our Presbyterian Church has always stood. And it does seem to me that any committee going about this task with a real impartiality would have offset its criticisms, whatever they were, with an acknowledgment of the nobility and grandeur of this great utterance produced by the directors of Union Seminary. Whoever wrote it is entitled to the profoundest thanks of the contemporary church.

But the one final point on which you will forgive my saying that I am totally unable to reconcile your report with an unbiassed attitude are the quotations on page 64 from the catalogue of 1914 and 1915, which are to be "read with care as shedding light on the general theological attitude." The two quotations there from the Union Seminary catalogue can be matched, I dare say (I speak without detailed examination) in every catalogue of every seminary, orthodox or otherwise, in this whole country. I have Professor McAfee's word for it that they can easily be matched from McCormick catalogue. The implication that Union Seminary is by such a statement as this tied up to "the Christologies of Dorner and Ritschl" is one that is surely insupportable, for a seminary would be no seminary at all if it did not teach its young men to understand what these doctrines are, regardless of its own attitude concerning them.

And finally, to complete this confession, I must admit that I thought I read a sneer at the bottom of page 64, "with special reference to the modern period." Here I own I heaved a great sigh and said, "Has it come to this?" The one thing that is the matter with the theological seminaries of all Christendom is that the teaching does not often have "special reference to the modern period." And from official committee of the Presbyterian Church in this late day of grace, 1915, to launch blame against any institution in all this earth for being modern seems to me to belie everything that we younger men have to fight for and maintain in this trying period of Christian history.

Now, dear Dr. Robinson, I have tried to be as frank as I know how, and you see I have not minced words. But I trust I may seem to you to have put into the letter all of the hearty friendliness and good will which were so fragrant in

your letter to me. If I have not succeeded in doing so, please attribute it to my lack of gifts as a letter writer and not to any intention or desire to be savage in controversy.

With heartiest good will,

Yours faithfully,

Nolan R. Best

NRB.LT

LITTLE FALLS, N.Y.
ROME, N.Y.
BROCKVILLE, ONT., CAN.

CABLE ADDRESS "FABIUS-NEW YORK"
A.B.C. CODE USED - 5TH EDITION

D. H. Burrell & Co.

Little Falls, N.Y., U.S.A. Sept. 23, 1911.

My dear Dr. Robinson:-

Your very welcome letter was received by me. Absence from my office owing to a severe cold I contracted about the time the letter came, and stress of work, has prevented an earlier reply. I am sure you will pardon the delay under the circumstances.

I shall be very greatly interested in the outcome with reference to Troy. I have an idea that you would accomplish a great deal of good in that City if you were to be transfered from Philadelphia, but I also feel that the work will be pretty hard and severe. However, I am not sure but that the same sort of conditions are prevailing throughout the entire Country.

I am glad, and I know that you are, that an effort is going to be made to interest business men throughout the Country, and in some late account which I have seen in the press, I judge that sufficient money will be supplied by such people as the Morgans, the McCormacks and others who are very rich, and who certainly ought to appreciate the fact, that if their property is going to be protected and taken care of, it is by an awakening conscience on the part of the mass of the people, and I mean a religious awakening. All sorts of theories and "isms" have been "tried out" over and over again for centuries, but whenever any real progress or advance is made in any community, it is by reason of the influence of the gospel of our Lord and Savior.

Your visits to Little Falls have always been appreciated and greatly enjoyed, and our people have been wonderfully interested not only, but instructed and benefited by your sermons. On Monday after you were here, I met some men who were present in the evening who were not in the habit of attending Church anywhere, and they were enthusiastic in their comments upon the Sunday Evening Service. It is a wonderful thing to be a Minister of the Gospel.

Mrs. Burrell and my family enjoyed your hour at our home, very much, indeed, and we hope that sometime in the future - perhaps during the next summer vacation - that Mrs. Robinson can accompany you, when, if all is well at that time, we would be very happy to have you come directly to our home and spend the Sabbath with us.

Thanking you heartily for your letter, and with kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
D. H. Burrell.

D. H. Burrell

Rev. W. C. Robinson, D. D.,
3504 Baring Street,
Philadelphia, Pa.

TELEPHONES

J. W. HELFFRICH

POWELTON STORAGE HOUSE

38TH STREET AND POWELTON AVE.

PHILADELPHIA, October 21, 1911.

Rev. C. W. Robinson, D. D.

3504 Baring Street.

Dear Dr. Robinson:

I am very sorry you did not come see me or at least request my coming to see you before you wrote to me. You have always been a good friend to me, and as friend to friend I tell you very candidly your letter hurt me very much, since you did not give me a chance to state my side of the question before you wrote it. In the first place I talked with Dr. Moyer and he encouraged me very much, of course he expressd his regret at my leaving the Sunday School. Secondly; I talked with the girls and encouraged them to go into Miss Alexander's class, or in the Teacher Training Class. Two of the girls as you probably know have moved out of the neighborhood, Emma Walter cannot come every Sunday and Helen Smiley would not come without Margaret, so I probably would have been without a class the most of the time. I was very glad to hear that three of them were there on Sunday, andhope they can and will continue to come. They probably did come a great many times because I asked them to, and I realized that they were beyond my really helping them as I knew them too well, so do not feel that I did any of them any harm by giving them up.

You surely are interested in Mission work, but feel that since you speak about my leaving in the manner you did, that perhaps I did a wise thing in not coming to you, since

TELEPHONES J. W. HELFFRICH

POWELTON STORAGE HOUSE

38TH STREET AND POWELTON AVE.

PHILADELPHIA, October 21, 1911.

you would have probably have discouraged my going to the Mission. I saw the need and felt it and after a great deal of consideration of my class and the other work, felt called to do as I am doing. How long it shall be for I do not know. I hope nothing will prevent my continuing down there as long as I am able. I know there is trouble down there and only hope it will soon be cleared away in a satisfactory manner. The work the girls have been doing down there should be a great satisfaction to Northminster, but they feel that Northminster has not been with them in spirt in this matter. A word of encouragement once in a while goes a great ways when one is putting forth their greatest efforts in the way they have to help the Cause.

I feel too that I probably did well to leave the Sunday School when I did,or I might have been put on the shelf, as it were, as my sister Bessie has been. This had not happened however when I decided to leave. She has been a very faithful worker in the Sunday School, and willing and anxious to do all she can. When I spoke about leaving, I was told they were short of teachers, when she decided that the class she had could not be kept to-gether any longer, she was told they had to-many teachers.

What the many mistakes are I cannot see and would be glad to hear further from you about it.

Very sincerely,

Margaret H. Bartram

David H. Burrell
Overlook
Little Falls, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Robinson:-

I thank you for your courteous letter of the 7th.

While we were disappointed that you could not be with us on the Sabbath referred to by you, yet we understood perfectly that, under the circumstances, you could not do otherwise than to attend upon the funeral of your uncle.

It is very sad to have ties that are dear to us, severed by the death of a relative or friend. You will have very pleasant memories of the uncle "whose home had always been a happy visiting place".

Our congregation has a very warm place in their hearts for you, as I am sure you know.

We enjoyed having Mrs. Robinson and yourself at our home, and we hope in the future summer vacations, to frequently have you with us.

Will you kindly remember Mrs. Burrell and myself to Mrs. Robinson, and with affectionate regard, I remain,

Very truly yours,
D. H. Burrell.

D. H. Burrell

Rev. W. C. Robinson, D. D.,
Delhi, N. Y.

August 10, 1914.